Case 1:12-cv-07667-HB Document 50 Filed 08/06/13 Page 1 of 6

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

BEVERLY ADKINS, CHARMAINE WILLIAMS, REBECCA PETTWAY, RUBBIE McCOY, WILLIAM YOUNG and MICHIGAN LEGAL SERVICES, on behalf of themselves and all others similar situated.

Plaintiffs,

-against-

MORGAN STANLEY, MORGAN STANLEY & CO. LLC, MORGAN STANLEY ABS CAPITAL I INC., MORGAN STANLEY MORTGAGE CAPITAL INC., and MORGAN STANLEY MORTGAGE CAPITAL HOLDINGS LLC,

Defendants.

DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED	USDS SDNY
	ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:	DOC #:
DATE FILED: 8 21 3	DATE FILED: 8 24 3

CASE NO. 12-cv-7667

Hon. Harold Baer

JOINT MOTION FOR ADOPTION OF REVISED SCHEDULING ORDER

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 16(b)(4), the Parties respectfully request that the Court amend the Pretrial Scheduling Order entered on January 4, 2013, in order to correct a drafting error and to reallocate time within the existing discovery period.¹ The grounds for this motion are set forth below.

1. On December 28, 2012, the Parties submitted a Stipulated Pretrial Scheduling Order to this Court. The Parties intended that certain of the case events would be counted from the due dates for Plaintiffs' motion for class certification and Defendants' opposition to the motion for

¹ Defendants today filed a motion to stay this matter pending the Supreme Court's decision in Township of Mount Holly v. Mount Holly Gardens Citizens in Action, Inc., No. 11-1507 (U.S. June 17, 2013), in which the Court will consider whether disparate impact claims are cognizable under the Fair Housing Act. The motion asks, in the alternative, for certification of the Court's July 25, 2013 Order for appeal under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b). Plaintiffs oppose the request. Defendants join this motion for modification of the Scheduling Order to the extent that the Court denies their motion.

Case 1:12-cv-07667-HB Document 54 Filed 08/21/13 Page 2 of 6

Case 1:12-cv-07667-HB Document 50 Filed 08/06/13 Page 2 of 6

class certification, which were Event # 9 and Event # 11, respectively, in the proposed order submitted to this Court. However, the proposed order inadvertently referred to "Event # 8" and "Event # 10" instead, and these drafting errors, which the Parties regret, meant that the proposed schedule did not accurately reflect the Parties' intent.

- 2. As a result of the above, the Scheduling Order entered by this Court on January 4, 2013 contained scheduling inconsistencies² that the Parties now seek to correct, while preserving the length of the overall case calendar that the Court set forth.
- 3. The Parties propose the revised schedule on the following page. This schedule maintains the same 12-month period between the decision on the motion to dismiss and the close of class certification briefing that this Court ordered in the previous schedule. Further, the original schedule defined the due dates by reference to time periods instead of using specific calendar dates, given that the decision on the motion to dismiss had not yet been issued. After this Court's July 25, 2013, decision on the motion to dismiss, the Parties now present specific proposed dates to the Court.
- 4. This is the Parties' first request for a modification in the schedule. The Parties make the request with good cause, as set forth above.

² For example, under the existing Order the motion for class certification is due ten months from the decision on the motion to dismiss, while the opposition to that motion, erroneously counted from Event # 8 instead of Event # 9, is due 165 days from the decision on the motion to dismiss—i.e., more than four months before the class certification motion would be filed.

PROPOSED REVISED PRETRIAL SCHEDULING ORDER

August 26 Last day to join additional parties as of right Last day to join additional claims Last day to complete pre-class certification, non- expert discovery Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification and disclosures of expert witnesses due Plaintiffs to make experts and declarants not reviously identified as potential witnesses available for deposition Defendants' Opposition to Motion for Class Certification and disclosures of expert witnesses due Defendants to make experts and declarants not pereviously identified as potential witnesses available or deposition Defendants to make experts and declarants not pereviously identified as potential witnesses available or deposition Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Class Certification Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Class Certification July 24, 2		
Last day to join additional claims Last day to complete pre-class certification, non-expert discovery Claintiffs' Motion for Class Certification and disclosures of expert witnesses due Claintiffs to make experts and declarants not deposition Defendants' Opposition to Motion for Class Certification and disclosures of expert witnesses due Defendants to make experts and declarants not deposition Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Class Certification Due Due	July 25, 2013 August 26, 2013 October 23, 2013 January 27, 2014	
Last day to complete pre-class certification, non-expert discovery Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification and disclosures of expert witnesses due Plaintiffs to make experts and declarants not previously identified as potential witnesses available for deposition Defendants' Opposition to Motion for Class Certification and disclosures of expert witnesses due Defendants to make experts and declarants not previously identified as potential witnesses available for deposition Defendants to make experts and declarants not previously identified as potential witnesses available for deposition Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Class Certification Duly 24, 2		
Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification and disclosures of expert witnesses due Plaintiffs to make experts and declarants not previously identified as potential witnesses available or deposition Defendants' Opposition to Motion for Class Certification and disclosures of expert witnesses due Defendants to make experts and declarants not previously identified as potential witnesses available or deposition Defendants to make experts and declarants not previously identified as potential witnesses available or deposition Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Class Certification Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Class Certification July 24, 2		
Plaintiffs to make experts and declarants not previously identified as potential witnesses available or deposition Defendants' Opposition to Motion for Class Certification and disclosures of expert witnesses due Defendants to make experts and declarants not previously identified as potential witnesses available or deposition Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Class Certification Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Class Certification July 24, 2		
Defendants or deposition Defendants' Opposition to Motion for Class Certification and disclosures of expert witnesses due Defendants to make experts and declarants not previously identified as potential witnesses available for deposition Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Class Certification Defendants deposition By July 9, Plaintiffs deposition Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Class Certification July 24, 2	, 2014	
Defendants to make experts and declarants not previously identified as potential witnesses available or deposition Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Class Certification July 24, 2 Due	24, 2014, provided that its may elect to take any ns through June 9, 2014	
Plaintiffs deposition Plaintiffs' Reply in Support of Class Certification Due Plaintiffs deposition July 24, 2	014	
Due	, 2014, provided that may elect to take any ns through July 24, 2014.	
Parties to meet and confer and file a report to 30 days for	2014	
address a further schedule through trial Plaintiffs' Certificati	ollowing a decision on 'Motion for Class	
Last day for dispositive motions to be fully briefed 3 months	before trial-ready date	

IT IS SO ORDERED:

The Honorable Hard Baer, Jr. United States District Judge

Case 1:12-cv-07667-HB Document 50 Filed 08/06/13 Page 4 of 6

Dated: August 6, 2013

Respectfully submitted,

Dy. _

Dennis D. Parker

Laurence M. Schwartztol

Rachel E. Goodman

American Civil Liberties Union Foundation

125 Broad Street, 18th Floor

New York, NY 10004

Telephone: (212) 549-2500

Facsimile: (212) 549-2651

Stuart T. Rossman

Charles M. Delbaum

Arielle Cohen

The National Consumer Law Center

7 Winthrop Square, 4th Floor

Boston, MA 02210

Telephone: (617) 542-8010

Facsimile: (617) 542-8028

Michael J. Steinberg

Kary L. Moss

American Civil Liberties Union Fund of Michigan

2966 Woodward Avenue

Detroit, MI 48201

Telephone: (313) 578-6814

Facsimile: (313) 578-6811

Elizabeth J. Cabraser

Michael W. Sobol

Lieff Cabraser Heimann and Bernstein LLP

Embarcadero Center West

275 Battery Street, 29th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94111

Telephone: (415) 956-1000

Facsimile: (415) 956-1008

Rachel J. Geman

Lieff Cabraser Heimann and Bernstein LLP

250 Hudson Street, 8th Floor

New York, NY 10013

Telephone: (212) 355-9500

Case 1:12-cv-07667-HB Document 54 Filed 08/21/13 Page 5 of 6

Case 1:12-cv-07667-HB Document 50 Filed 08/06/13 Page 5 of 6

Facsimile: (212) 355-9592 Counsel for Plaintiffs

By: /s/ David W. Ogden

Noah A. Levine
Colin T. Reardon
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
7 World Trade Center
250 Greenwich Street
New York, NY 10007
Telephone: (212) 230-8800
Facsimile: (212) 230-8888

David W. Ogden
Danielle Y. Conley
Brian M. Boynton
Jonathan Bressler
Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 663-6440
Facsimile: (202) 663-6363
Counsel for Defendants